

**PART I. Washington's Experience with Work Release**

*by David A. Savage, Director, Division of Community Corrections, Washington Department of Corrections*

**T**he Washington State Department of Corrections, Division of Community Corrections, administers fifteen work release programs ranging in size from fifteen to 100 beds and also operates two pre-release facilities. Offenders in these programs currently constitute about 12 percent of offenders incarcerated under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections.

Work release programs were instituted in Washington with the passage of enabling legislation in 1967. As in other states, work release programs are located in a variety of structures: large, older homes converted to small residential facilities, hotel and apartment buildings converted to larger facilities, and buildings that have been designed and constructed specifically as work release facilities.

These programs serve several functions in the state's corrections system:

- As a transition for offenders, during the last part of their sentences, from the total confinement of prison to a less restrictive environment in the community;
- As a condition of probation-in the late 1970s and early '80s some courts began sentencing offenders directly to work release facilities rather than to prison;
- As an alternative to prison for parole violators; and
- As an alternative to confinement in county jails. Some counties operate work release facilities in connection with their jails to provide an alternative to total confinement.

Until the early '80s, Washington state prisons provided limited program opportunities. Consequently offenders were often placed in work release-where programs were available-for more than a year. Work release gave offenders the opportunity to participate in educational and vocational programs and access to such resources as drug and alcohol counseling. It also allowed frequent contact and rebonding with their families.

Since 1981, when Washington instituted determinate sentencing-with its emphasis on punishment-inmates have been eligible for work release only during the last six months of their sentences. At present, the average stay in work release is about four months. The determinate sentence law precludes many offenders from receiving meaningful supervision after their release from prison, so we have reserved work release primarily as a transitional program for determinate cases.

Parole supervision of those with indeterminate sentences already provides some transitional services.

## Issues Facing Work Release in Washington

Work release programs in Washington have undergone significant examination over the past few years. Although work release programs are reviewed and upgraded annually, increasing pressures on the system are forcing change. These pressures include population growth, budget constraints, and calls for efficiency and effectiveness. During fiscal year 1992-93 the number of work release beds will be increased by 480 beds-the largest growth in the history of work release.

Consequently, the next year may see major changes in the ways work release in the state is operated, funded, and evaluated. I am confident that many of the issues we are facing are also common to the operation of work release in other jurisdictions. These issues include state vs. contractor operation, cost, community involvement, program content, quality of operation, offender placement in work release, and the role of work release in managing inmate population growth.

### *State vs. Contractor Operation*

Most of Washington's work release programs are operated by private contractors. We are fortunate to have several experienced contractors that provide quality programs. For each program the contractor is responsible for: day-to-day operation of the facility, including facility security; provision and maintenance of housing; food services; offender monitoring; and compliance with a variety of operational standards. Department of Corrections staff in work release programs include a full- or part-time supervisor, a person providing clerical support, and one community corrections officer for every twenty work release residents. State staff provide day-to-day case management of offenders and monitor contract compliance.

Although we have been happy with contractors' performance, we are currently looking at ways to make the contracting process more efficient. When contracting for expansion beds, the DOC will select contractors through a formal competitive process. In addition, the state hopes to retain the work release site even if the contractor changes. Contracts will be issued for two years to match the state's biennial budget. Contractors have been involved with the department in reviewing and updating contract standards with which they will comply.

### *Cost*

The cost of work release beds in Washington ranges from \$21.50 to \$44.00. Costs at the bottom end of the scale do not include any specialized programs. At the top end, we purchase beds for a special needs population and expect the contractor to provide specialized programming. Offenders in work release facilities pay \$10 a day for room and board, thereby decreasing costs to taxpayers and assuming partial responsibility for the cost of their work release.

Private, not-for-profit contractors can usually provide beds less expensively than the state can, and there is economy in numbers. The least expensive beds are those purchased by contract in the largest facilities. In the two cases in which we contract

with counties to provide work release programs, costs per bed are greater than those provided by contractors. Since both private contractors and public agencies must meet the same contract standards, the difference in cost is primarily attributable to the fact that public agencies pay salaries and benefits in accordance with bargaining agreements that substantially increase labor costs. As we believe that the quality of work release programs is directly related to providing qualified, well-trained and experienced staff, the Division of Community Corrections is working to develop a standardized staff compensation plan for all work release operators.

An attractive feature of work release has been its cost effectiveness. As inflation continues to take its toll in a runaway economy, and as the cost of providing quality work release beds comes closer to the cost of providing prison beds, it will be interesting to see whether the savings in work release beds remains significant. The cost of work release should be a factor in determining its future, but it should not be the sole factor taken into consideration when planning to maintain existing programs or to expand in the future. The challenge for administrators of work release programs is to run cost-efficient facilities that provide an acceptable level of security and meaningful programs at a cost attractive to those responsible for funding.

### *Community Involvement*

Community involvement is an essential component of work release in the State of Washington. All of our work release facilities, whether they are operated by the state or by contract, involve the community in some form. Some have community boards of directors or advisory boards involved in oversight. Some have citizens' screening committees that review every potential offender resident and provide input into the offender's programming in the facility. On the other end of the scale, some work release facilities have no direct involvement with the community beyond having established a good working relationship with the immediate neighborhood. Regardless of the degree of connection, though, community involvement has been at least partly responsible for the survival of work release in the state. Benefits have included a community consciousness of the advantages of work release and access to community resources for offenders.

Although siting of work release programs has become more difficult in recent years, the future acceptance of work release as an integral part of the correctional system depends on community awareness and involvement. A recent survey revealed that there is more tolerance for work release than anticipated. Results indicated that those **least** concerned about the location of work release are current neighbors of facilities-the people in the community who best know the program and offenders served.

The challenge of adding a large number of new beds over the next year has heightened the importance of the siting issue. A new state policy provides guidelines for identifying areas in the state where work release programs might be established and defines the process for choosing sites.

### *Program Content*

Although we have been generally satisfied with the program content of work release in the State of Washington, we have always tried to make it better. Work release has evolved beyond the provision of three decent meals and a bed for an offender employed or in school in the community.

Program content restricts the freedom of the offender in the community and also provides opportunity and encouragement. It helps offenders deal with problems that might affect their ability to remain free in the community rather than return to prison. In Washington, programming is usually provided apart from the work release facility. Although some of our facilities offer programs directly to the offender, the community generally provides drug and alcohol intervention and counseling, anger management, and educational programs, and the offender pays for them.

Work release programs are an ideal place to work with families to intervene in the cycle of criminal behavior. As we move into the '90s, we hope to expand work release programs to include services to offenders' families, as they play an integral part in the transition plan and can influence the offender to remain crime-free.

### *Quality*

The Department of Corrections has emphasized quality by establishing specific standards and monitoring compliance with them. Acceptance of the state's work releases standards is a condition of every contract agreement. The standards, which are reviewed annually by both the department and contractors, are intended to assure uniform quality in program provision across the state. They are also important in dealing with potential liability.

Standards are useless unless they are closely monitored. The DOC has employees in each contract facility who, in addition to other duties, are responsible for daily contract monitoring. Additionally, on an annual basis, each work release contractor is audited for compliance. Any non-compliance issue is resolved through corrective action to ensure full compliance. We are fortunate in having a group of contractors who are committed to the necessity of standards, a desire to comply with them, and the intention to provide quality work release programs.

### *Placement of Offenders in Work Release*

A major issue facing work release in Washington is the question of which offenders should be placed in work release. At times we have operated on the premise that nearly all offenders should be released through a work release program. At other times, we have been very selective. At no time have more than 40 percent of offenders been released from Washington state prisons through work release programs.

One issue in identifying inmates suitable for placement in work release is the offender's criminal history. Our custody classification model, which transcends all levels of confinement from close custody maximum security through work release, has helped us select offenders to be placed in work release, significantly improved our placement decisions, and helped reduce escapes.

We are still trying to develop a better method of screening out offenders based on a prediction of predatory violent behavior in the community. Regardless of how well work release programs are operated, the occurrence of a "crime of the year" involving a work release resident brings devastation to the community and potentially to the program. In some jurisdictions such occurrences have singlehandedly brought the demise of work release.

Despite the personal tragedy that such incidents represent, however, and the fact that we all work hard to avoid them, they do bring about an opportunity for a renewed look at work release. Although we were unfortunate to have had a couple of these occurrences in the past, the Department of Corrections and its work release contractors have worked together with the community to improve programs during these difficult times. Our experience has been that while things are running fine, there is little community interest in work release. Although certainly uninvited, a serious crime heightens the interest of the community and renews the vigor with which the community wants to understand the whys and hows of work release operation, who is in the facility, and how they are monitored. In each instance, a thorough external review involving the community has greatly improved the quality of the work release program.

### *Managing Prison Population Growth*

The role of work release in managing population growth is complex. Although there may be a direct relationship between the total population of offenders incarcerated in a jurisdiction and the proportion that can be appropriately placed in work release, one should not decide to expand work release solely on the basis of this relationship.

Instead, it is imperative to look closely at what is driving growth in the particular jurisdiction. It makes little sense for work release to be proportionally increased along with other confinement beds, for example, if the growing population reflects high numbers of offenders who have long sentences for serious crimes. However, to the extent that population increases are a reflection of diminished tolerance in the community for lesser crimes involving shorter sentences, a higher proportion of work release beds may be appropriate.

Historically, work release has proved to be a viable correctional component; as we have become more sophisticated in its application, it has become obvious that it has a reasonable role in managing population growth. Siting of work release facilities has become a major issue in the state of Washington, but the obvious time advantage offered in bringing on new work release beds also makes work release an attractive growth management tool.

**A**s correctional administrators, it is imperative that we recognize both the benefits and the limitations of work release programs, and that we provide programs in a manner that reflects responsibility, recognizes their complexity, and maintains a manageable level of risk.

***For further information, contact Dave Savage at P.O. Box 9699, MS FN-61, Olympia, Washington, 98504; telephone (206) 753-1573. ■***

**PART II: A Contractor's Perspective**

*by Michael Dumovich, Associate Director of Corrections, Pioneer Human Services, Seattle, Washington*

**T**he State of Washington illustrates a unique approach to work release programs, in which responsibility is shared between private contractors and state employees. State community corrections officers oversee case management and retain legal control over inmate movement. Contractors are responsible for the physical plant, the health and safety of residents, and some client services. This hybrid model has been highly successful.

In spite of this success, however, dwindling resources are now colliding with an increasing need for services. In the decade to come, the competition for dollars will be fierce among groups ranging from the homeless to the elderly. The community corrections service providers that manage to survive into the twenty-first century will do so only by satisfying multiple clients, who often have conflicting needs. Programs' survival will depend on their ability to identify and satisfy the needs of funding sources, the public, and clients. As operators of programs, we must therefore make every effort to:

- Provide for public safety;
- Be cost efficient;
- Elicit support from the public by educating them to community corrections' part in the criminal justice system; and
- Assess program outcomes realistically.

***Public Safety***

The reality of the public safety issue is that community corrections will always be vulnerable to a catastrophic event, such as the release or escape of someone who then commits a serious crime. Although it may be unfair to blame the physician for the disease, the public often believes that community corrections programs jeopardize public safety.

To attack the public safety myth, community corrections program administrators must develop a trained and motivated staff; apply policy and procedures consistently; maintain internal audits of performance standards; and solicit outside program evaluations.

***Cost Efficiency***

Washington citizens judge alternatives to incarceration on the degree to which it can both guarantee public safety and be cost efficient. As contractors we must avoid social service paradigms and prove that we run cost efficient facilities by spending

less than the budget; managing to the “bottom line”; controlling overhead; taking advantage of economies of scale; and developing multi-service facilities.

1. ***It's okay to be under budget.*** Social service managers have developed a “spend it or lose it” budgeting philosophy. This approach has often made cost saving measures invisible. Turning moneys back into a funding source at the end of the contract year is a legitimate budgeting goal—a tangible example of meeting the public’s requirement for cost efficiency.
2. ***Managing to the “bottom line” doesn’t mean that client services will be secondary.*** Financial accountability supports client services by ensuring continuity. Client services are often held hostage to fluctuations in funding. Managing to the bottom line demands that contractors prioritize services at the beginning of the fiscal cycle so that the same services will be available at the end of the cycle.
3. ***Overhead must be defined, controlled, and reassessed.*** A definition of overhead, or indirect costs, must be agreed upon and should match funding sources’ definitions. Professionals and the general public scrutinize indirect costs suspiciously. A set percentage, even as low as 10 percent, must be targeted. All financial decisions must consider the impact on the overhead target. Overhead should be consistently compared with that of other organizations. The goals must be reassessed each year using the comparisons as a measuring stick. Do not be afraid to brag about control of overhead.
4. ***Economies of scale do not automatically mean reduced results.*** There is no doubt that a twenty-bed facility offers an atmosphere that is hard to duplicate in a sixty-bed facility, but the intimacy and better staff/client ratios can be overcome by the additional program resources that a larger program can provide. A dynamic, large program can take advantage of specialization if maintaining the human touch is a consistent priority.
5. ***Multi-service facilities can offer more services to each individual program.*** While multi-service, multi-funded programs can be an administrative nightmare, resource sharing can enhance programming possibilities. As with supermarkets that stay open twenty-four hours, multi-service facilities can spread out their fixed costs. For example, adding an electronic home monitoring program with a day reporting center contract in a building housing a residential work release program can reduce fixed costs for all three programs. It will enable them to share responsibility for coverage and expose each program to the specific strengths of all three.

### ***Public Education***

The ostrich syndrome has prevailed too long among community corrections professionals. It is time for us to get the message out to the public about what we know, what we do, what our role is within the criminal justice system, and the fact that what we do works. Public education efforts at the local level should include:

- Involving the local community in the siting process from the beginning;
- Holding open houses in work release facilities; and

- Including local law enforcement representatives, community leaders, businessmen and other sectors of the community on facility advisory boards.

At the state level, community corrections professionals should coordinate an approach to developing white papers, writing letters and newspaper articles, and preparing specific legislative testimony. Individual organizations and professional associations should lobby state legislative officials.

Among community corrections' national objectives should be convincing lawmakers, criminal justice officials, and the general public that prison is not the only effective way to deal with offenders.

### *Outcome Evaluation*

Community corrections can no longer rely on informal anecdotes, instincts, or "dog and pony shows" to evaluate their efforts. Substantial resources must be devoted to the realistic assessment of program outcomes. We must be able to answer convincingly the question, "Does what we do make a difference?"

### *Pioneer Human Services' Approach*

Pioneer Human Services is a \$16 million, non-profit social service agency that currently provides 197 work release beds in four different facilities in Seattle, Washington. Pioneer has three main divisions: a Social Services Division, which includes its work release programs; an Industries Division; and an Enterprises Division.

### *Financial Base*

The State of Washington's community correction contracts are cost reimbursement contracts that permit no excess. Pioneer depends on government contracts for less than 30 percent of its income. Its financial base comes from its industry and enterprise components, which provide financial support to specific program areas and to the agency as a whole.

Pioneer Industries provides 150 work training positions that offer on-the-job apprenticeships, classroom work, individual tutoring and counseling, employee benefits, and an employee assistance program. The Enterprises Division maintains facilities and a food buying program that allows both employees and residents to share lower food costs. The success of these components has made possible enhancements to work release programs, expanded community relations, research and development, and staff development and training.

The agency's overhead is maintained at less than 10 percent, a figure that is substantially lower than average. Strict accountability is required from each program director, and a cost/benefit analysis is part of all resource allocations.

### *Auditing/Monitoring/Overview*

The agency ensures quality through internal auditing and monitoring. Each facility is audited quarterly, and cleanliness and repair standards are addressed monthly. The Washington Department of Corrections audits each facility yearly for



compliance with 150 state standards. All of Pioneer's work release facilities are accredited by the American Correctional Association Commission on Accreditation for Corrections.

### *Offender Programs*

The state has, for the most part, provided programs to meet clients' needs through on-site state community corrections officers. Through creative efforts, however, Pioneer has been able to develop program enhancements, which include:

- Weekly drug awareness programs, designed to interface with drug programs provided in state institutions;
- Weekly employment classes, which provide job seeking and job maintenance skills;
- Weekly group counseling sessions with experienced therapists;
- Weekly self-esteem classes; and
- Weekly parenting classes.

### *Accountability*

This year Pioneer Services is beginning to realize a major organizational objective: to find a way to measure the effectiveness of the work we do. In this connection, the agency is currently the subject of two evaluation projects. In the first, the Rand Corporation, funded by the National Institute of Justice, is conducting a three-part study entitled "Work Release in the State of Washington: Assessing Implementation and Impact on Offender Reintegration." The evaluation will provide detailed information on the impact of work release on offender recidivism and community reintegration-as measured by employment, family situation, drug and alcohol use, etc.-as well as program costs. Another aspect of the project will measure the effectiveness of the Pioneer Industry Program.

In addition, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development funded a comprehensive organization study by Charles E. Summer, Professor Emeritus of Business Policy and Strategy at the University of Washington. "Pioneer Human Services-An Entrepreneurial Approach to Problems of the Socially Disadvantaged" presents a case study and analysis of the Pioneer model. Publication is expected in the fall of 1991.

### *Community Relations*

Pioneer is involved in a variety of outreach efforts. The agency is a major contributor to the International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives' public education campaign to advocate community-based programs. Pioneer also belongs to the Washington State Contractors Association, a group of work release providers who have developed this cooperative forum to work for common goals, especially through collectively-designed legislation.

A local board of directors governs Pioneer's operations, and each facility has an advisory board comprised of members of the community. Neighborhood relations are addressed by participating in neighborhood projects and holding frequent open houses.

## The Future

Opportunities in the future are exciting, despite problems such as the “NIMBY” syndrome, a declining personnel pool, more competition for funding, and the public’s lack of understanding of our mission. As an organization, we hope in the future to be able to take advantage of the following:

1. ***New approaches to*** assessment-Assessment tools are being developed that will assist in the difficult decisions relating to resource allocation. Bonta and Andrews of Ottawa, among others, have established a revised level of supervision inventory which could add substance to our classification process.
2. ***A continuum of care*** - Models are being designed to give residents access to programs after they return to the community.
3. ***Multi-service centers*** - Community-based centers offer day reporting centers, electronic home monitoring, treatment components, food, housing assistance, and employment opportunities.
4. ***Public education efforts*** - These could be approached cooperatively by all facets of the criminal justice system.
5. ***Shared training resources*** - Service providers need to cooperate to maximize training efforts to improve the recruitment and retention of staff.

***For further information, contact Michael Dumovich, Pioneer Human Services, Bishop Lewis House, 703 Eighth Avenue, Seattle, Washington, 98104; telephone (206) 682-4522. ■***

### PART III. Programs in Action

#### Sedgwick County's Team Concept for Residential Program Management

Sedgwick County Community Corrections opened a residential program in Wichita, Kansas, in July 1983. Since then, the program has grown to a capacity of 108 clients and a staff of thirty-six. It is highly structured and emphasizes client supervision, rehabilitative referrals, and accountability.

Residents of the program are expected to maintain full-time employment and/or enrollment in an educational or vocational program in the community. Clients must budget their personal income to meet court-ordered and program-related financial obligations, complete therapeutic program goals, and master daily living skills, all toward eventual reintegration in the community. The average length of stay is four months.

For six years, the program operated with rigid divisions of labor and lines of authority. However, in order to improve overall program effectiveness while increasing staff involvement and motivation, the agency has begun to encourage teamwork at all levels. It also is attempting to provide training for all staff in program management and client supervision. Staff then have the opportunity to put that training into practice through a system of self-managing treatment teams.

There are four such treatment teams in the program, each providing day-to-day security and supervision. Each team includes a case manager and five to six corrections technicians. Teams work under the pre-existing management team of a senior case

manager, facility manager, and residential supervisor. Under the new system, team members have opportunities for taking on additional responsibilities and for professional growth.

The case manager is the designated team leader and supervises five to six corrections technicians. Specific responsibilities include scheduling shifts, leading weekly team meetings, hiring and training new team personnel, and evaluating technicians' performance. The case manager also performs daily security/control functions while technicians are absent or performing case management functions. Newly assigned team leaders receive training, technical support, and guidance from the management team.

Corrections technicians provide twenty-four-hour security, document observations and investigations of client behavior, and facilitate client accountability. In addition to being trained in security/control techniques, corrections technicians also receive training in case management.

The traditional corrections model for running a residential facility, in which "security" and "treatment" staff are separated, has been scrapped. Providing corrections technicians and team-leading case managers with greater involvement and autonomy has improved our staff's morale, sense of ownership, and accountability. Contributions of the corrections technicians to client security and supervision have increased dramatically, and the experience, knowledge, and enthusiasm gained by our entire staff have made this challenging approach worthwhile.

One of the program's four treatment teams addresses drug and alcohol abuse education

and the rehabilitation needs of clients. The team can treat up to twenty-four offenders and receives funding support from the U.S. Department of Justice.

This co-ed program lengthens the active treatment process through pre-treatment, post-treatment, and relapse prevention components. Clients are evaluated upon admission to the residential facility and, if identified as appropriate for the program, are included as space becomes available. Program components include:

- A pre-treatment program of six weeks' duration.
- Inpatient treatment.
- A post-treatment program, consisting of three to four weeks of continuing care and follow-up assessment.
- A relapse program of counseling for any client who uses alcohol or any other psychoactive drug or who demonstrates explicit pre-consumptive symptoms.

The treatment program makes an allowance for the discharge of clients who are unwilling to recognize and address their substance use disorders during pre-treatment. If discharged from the treatment program, clients are placed in the general residential population for a minimum of thirty days and may reapply for the program after that time. Specific recovery-related treatment tasks are assigned to the client during the interim period.

Security, treatment, and reintegration of clients are monitored by a specialized team comprising two certified drug/alcohol counselors, one case manager, and five to six corrections technicians.

*For further information contact Darryl A. Stamp, Interim Director, Sedgwick County Community Corrections, (316) 383-7003, or Mike Yearty, Director, Program Development, Parallax, Inc., (316) 263-5809. ■*

## Electronic Monitoring: A New Approach to Work Release

The telephone was ringing as electronic detention participant Jones returned home from work. Jones was half an hour late according to his approved movement schedule, and community correctional center staff had initiated response procedures to locate him.

This scenario could be played out at any Illinois community correctional center on any given day, because the centers have a central role in the operation of the Department of Corrections' electronic detention (E.D.) program.

Working cooperatively with parole agents assigned to the Special Intensive Supervision Unit, the centers have served 1,540 E.D. participants since the June 1989 program onset. Of those 1,540 participants, 645 have successfully completed the program, and 384 have been returned to prison for technical program violations. There have been eight arrests for new crimes, but only two have led to prosecution by local law enforcement officials. The primary reason for this success is the personal involvement of the community correctional center staff in client screening, programming, and monitoring.

### Program Requirements

The E.D. program is for offenders in work release status, and they are required to abide by the same guidelines as those who live at a center. These guidelines require participants to be involved in employment, education, and /or vocational training for more than thirty-five hours per week. Those not actively participating in programming must demonstrate that they are trying to become involved in it.

Offenders being considered for the E.D. program are initially screened by a center counselor who also orients them to the program. After conducting a needs assessment, the counselor helps the offender develop an individual program contract that defines specific goals. Prospective participants also sign an agreement to

abide by the program rules-counselors clearly inform them that failure to abide by the agreement will result in their being returned to prison with the possible loss of good conduct credits.

Once in the program, the E.D. participant reports weekly to the center to meet with his or her counselor for thirty to forty-five minutes. During these meetings, counselors review participants' progress in accomplishing their program goals. The counselor also approves the next week's itinerary, which includes specific times for each activity so that the participant's movements can be monitored.

Participants are aware that they may be tested for drugs or alcohol at any time. They may be required to submit to urinalysis either during their weekly visits to the center or at any other time that their counselor determines that testing is necessary.

Participants also must turn in their paychecks and work with the counselor to budget their incomes for living expenses. Like center residents, E.D. participants must pay maintenance to the department at a rate of 20 percent of their earnings to a maximum of \$50 per week.

The most important result of the weekly counseling sessions is that they give E.D. participants an opportunity to identify with their counselors and the counselors a chance to know them.

### **Security**

The role of the E.D. agent is to be a watchdog, acting as the community corrections center's eye in the community. Although center staff spot-check E.D. participants' movements by telephone, there are insufficient staff to allow physical visits or to follow up on those missing. E.D. agents are required to make face-to-face conduct with their clients at least twice a week.

Agents are on call seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day to respond to alarms sounded when E.D. participants are missing. In these instances, the agent visits the host site and other areas where the

offender might be, such as with other family members. If all efforts to locate the participant fail, he or she is placed on escape status. Department rules permit revocation of up to one year of good conduct credits for escape, and local law enforcement may prosecute as well.

Mr. Jones was fortunate. He was just a little late, but he made a mistake by not phoning the center to tell staff that he was late leaving work and would be late returning home. Since this was the first time it has happened and he hasn't had any other problems, Mr. Jones will probably just receive a lecture. But if it becomes a habit or he is unavailable for longer periods, he won't be allowed to stay in the program.

### **Accountability**

Electronic monitoring fosters accountability. Participants are forced to schedule, plan ahead, and budget their earnings. This structured environment provides a support base that allows them to gradually reintegrate into their home communities.

It is important to convince the public that safety is actually improved when participants learn to take on more responsibility at the same time they are being held accountable. The alternative, "cold turkey" release to both the freedom and responsibilities of the outside world, is often too much for the releasee to handle. The result may be a return to crime, reliance on drugs or alcohol, and ultimately another prison term.

### **Cost Savings**

Agencies considering implementation of electronic monitoring programs must be careful not to be misled by dollar signs and promises of an easy and inexpensive way to solve a population crunch. However, electronic monitoring is economical. In Illinois, prison incarceration requires an estimated \$16,200 per year per inmate, compared to an estimated \$7,034 for electronic monitoring. This includes the cost of the monitor at about \$3,285 and another \$3,849 per participant for staff salaries and overhead costs.

Although Illinois has been able to save more than \$9,000 per inmate per year with the E.D. program, E.D. would be even less expensive if the human element were eliminated. However, I do not believe the program would be as successful without agents who serve as models and who make

regular contact with participants. The technology of to&y can be used to enhance existing programs, but it is only as effective as the people who use it.

*For further information, contact Anthony Scillia, Logan Correctional Center, R.R. 3, Lincoln, Illinois, 62566; (217) 735-5581. ■*

## Residential Program Briefs

- The **Connecticut** DOC has opened two facilities for post-incarceration inmates approved for Supervised Home Release but lacking the required sponsor: Fellowship House is a seven-bed "supervised shelter" that also has a community service component; Retreat Avenue House provides twenty-four offenders with programming in job development, drug and alcohol counseling, financial management, and life skills. The DOC has also opened eight new privately-contracted Alternative Incarceration Centers, for a total of sixteen in the state. NEON, a new residential program for women and children, stresses parenting skills and family programs.
- **Florida** tightened admissions criteria for work release programs and added stricter requirements for verifying offender location. The state hopes to "enhance community safety and re-establish the integrity of community work release in Florida."
- The **Illinois** DOC plans to open a 200-bed facility in Chicago that will be a pre-placement facility for offenders entering the electronic monitoring program and a reporting center for offenders already in the program. Targeted offender groups are technical parole violators and violators convicted of minor non-violent offenses.
- **Iowa** is in the planning and construction stages for 350 beds at new and existing facilities. Each will house twenty to forty-eight offenders, and a forty-eight-bed facility is planned for women and their children. Goals are to provide a revocation alternative for probation and parole technical violators, a direct sentencing option for prison-bound offenders, increased residential capacity to reduce waiting lists, wider geographic availability of RCCs, and expanded residential options for repeat substance-abusing offenders and/or female offenders.
- The **Michigan** DOC and the League of Catholic Women opened Project Transition, a program for women and children at risk that targets pregnant female prisoners. It provides counseling on substance abuse, medical, and family and parenting issues as well as postnatal care. Length of the program is six months to over one year.
- To reduce drug use among facility residents, the **Michigan** DOC Community Residential Programs Division instituted mandatory semi-monthly random drug testing. Offenders testing positive for the first time participate in outpatient treatment as available; participation is mandatory following a second positive test. Offenders with three or more positives are moved to a higher security level in prison and are denied future community placement. Positive tests have dropped from 14.7 percent in October 1988 to 4.8 percent in September 1989. ■